

Remarks

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 68-70, 72-75, 77-84, 88, 120, 121, and 124 are now pending, of which claim 68 is the only independent claim. Claims 71, 76, 122, 123, and 125 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claim 68 has been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed disclosure, including, for example, in the originally-filed claims, and at page 14, line 25 through page 15, line 8, and page 32, line 5 through page 33, line 9, of the specification. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the amendments do not include new matter.

The June 24, 2008 Office Action rejects claims 68-84, 88, and 120-124 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,605,343 (Motoi)<sup>1</sup> in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,474,721 (Stevens).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and submit that the cited references fail to suggest the invention recited in previously-pending independent claim 68, for at least the reasons set forth in the September 8, 2008 Request for Reconsideration and October 8, 2008 Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review. Applicants have determined, however, that the combination of features recited in previously-pending independent claim 68 will not be commercialized at this time. Accordingly, in an effort to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action refers to Motoi as U.S. Patent No. 6,635,343. Applicants assume this was a typographical error, and that the Office Action intended to refer to U.S. Patent No. 6,605,343.

have amended independent claim 68 so as to now emphasize other features that are not suggested by the cited references to Motoi and Stevens, as described below.

Amended independent claim 68 recites a method of making an elongated composite, structural material comprising, inter alia, supplying a single strip of a porous web material selected from the group consisting of paper and cloth, with the web material including a barrier layer comprising polyvinyl alcohol. Claim 68 further recites forcing the single strip of web material into a sleeve-like configuration by wrapping and pulling the single strip of web material over an elongated mandrel having the desired cross-sectional shape of the structural material, with a cord-carrying side of the web material facing the mandrel.

Applicants submit that Motoi does not disclose or suggest a web material including a barrier layer comprising polyvinyl alcohol, as recited in amended independent claim 68. As such, the materials disclosed Motoi do not have a barrier that would stop migration of the epoxy thermosetting-resin-precursor mixture through the materials, as also recited in amended independent claim 68.

Applicants further submit that Motoi does not disclose or suggest forcing a single strip of web material into a sleeve-like configuration by wrapping and pulling the single strip of web material over an elongated mandrel, as recited in amended independent claim 68. None of the disclosed processes in Motoi uses a single strip of web material to form a sleeve-like configuration, let alone includes a step of forcing a single strip of web material into a sleeve-like configuration through the use of a mandrel. For example, in the embodiment depicted in Figure 3 of Motoi uses a shaping die 44 to shape a plurality of fibers 55 into the configuration of the composite material (See col. 23, line 35 through col. 24, line 12). As another example, in the embodiment depicted in Figure 13 of Motoi moving molds 86 are used to shape a plurality of

fiber bundles 85 into the configuration of the composite material (See col. 28, lines 4-67).

Neither of these embodiments of Motoi, nor any other processes described in the reference, forces a single strip of web material into a sleeve-like configuration using a mandrel.

Applicants further submit that Stevens does not cure the deficiencies of Motoi. That is, Stevens does not disclose or suggest a process using a web material that includes a barrier layer, nor forcing a single strip of web material into a sleeve-like configuration by wrapping and pulling the single strip of web material over an elongated mandrel, as recited in amended independent claim 68.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the cited art fails to teach or suggest Applicants' invention recited in amended independent claim 68. Accordingly, that claim should be deemed allowable.

The dependent claims also should be deemed allowable, in their own right, for defining other patentable features of Applicants' invention in addition to those recited in claim 68. Further individual consideration of all of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration rejection set forth in the June 24, 2008 Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

\* \* \*

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached in the Washington, D.C. office of Fitzpatrick, Cella, Harper & Scinto by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

*/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./*

---

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200